

Poor Chicago James Ridgeway

THE NEW REPUBLIC

May 15, 1965, 35 cents

Wave of the Past

In reviewing Lyndon Johnson's first hundred days as elected President, we wrote that his astuteness and humanity would meet their toughest test in foreign affairs. On the results to date, he just misses flunking. Just misses, in our judgment, because he has not yet bombed Hanoi, we are not yet at war with China, and the President did refuse to try and ram an Atlantic nuclear navy down Europe's throat. Otherwise, the score is mighty poor. There has been a series of expanding errors, beginning with the brusque handling of Panama and culminating, thus far, in the widening war in Vietnam and last week's invasion of the Dominican Republic. For all the Administration's belated bows before the Organization of American States, sending 25,000 American servicemen to the Dominican Republic violated the OAS charter, which declares in at least two of its articles that no state or states have the right to intervene in the affairs of any other state, and that on no grounds whatever may any OAS territory be subject even temporarily to military occupation. It would therefore be a touching homage to honesty were Ambassador Stevenson to (Continued on page 5)

APR 15 1965
HAROLD WEISSBERG
NEW YORK
PAPER NEWSPAPER

T.R.B.

from
Washington

On Revolution

★ Vietnam and the Dominican Republic are alike in some ways. Each is backward. Each has an exploding population that hates money-lenders, tax collectors and landlords. Circumstances differ, of course, but in each case homes are primitive, lives short and improvement so difficult that Communism looks interesting.

We don't want the two countries to try Communism. We want them to achieve the better life by democratic, constitutional reform that won't expropriate anybody or kill anybody. How do they do it? Why, they vote for it, the way we do and we will help a bit. We aren't rigid about our ideas either; we don't let illiterates vote at home but we think it might be all right for them to do so abroad, provided they select firm, benevolent, intelligent leaders, legally elected, with middle-class aspirations and a passion for free enterprise.

Well, it seems a bit difficult, doesn't it? The tricky Communists are right there, always ready to take an unfair advantage of misery. The US is trying to shoot down an idea with rocket missiles. Something more is needed.

In the world at large the gap between rich and poor is widening all the time. Marx thought of the gap as between people, but today the class war is developing between nations. Worse still, it is tending to be between races, the long-nosed blonds against the dark-skinned.

We wealthy countries are badly outnumbered; we are just a comfortable suburb sitting outside the teeming millions of the impoverished. Santo Domingo isn't the island; we are. Anybody with half an eye can see a revolution

coming, when the rising population line slices through the food line. Some economists like Gunnar Myrdal say this will happen in 10 years.

This column can be wrong. But to us it isn't a question of whether there is a revolution, but whether it will be peaceful or bloody. In Paraguay, for example, it was estimated, a couple of years ago, that 1,552 landlords under dictator Stroesser own three-fourths of the land; that 25 people hold acreage equivalent to Denmark, Belgium and Holland.

In one of his statements last week at the White House, Mr. Johnson noted that his intelligence reports each morning indicate difficulties in "dozens of spots" throughout the world: "We were due at least one revolution in another country yesterday," he observed. "It didn't come through, but intelligence reports had indicated it might."

So this is the story of the revolution that didn't come through. It's waiting there all right. It will come. It will come.

Ike's Advice

★ As the President strolled around the lovely White House grounds last week at twilight, trying to unwind, accompanied by a phalanx of reporters, he cited a letter from General Eisenhower. Ike wrote: "If there is anyone who opposes the President in his conduct of our foreign affairs, he should send his views on a confidential basis to the Administration; none of us should try to divide the support that citizens owe to their Head of State in critical international situations."

We trust you will all take this to heart. If you want to complain about Vietnam or Santo Domingo, go through channels.

George Meany

★ Is there any other country besides the US where business is more liberal than labor in a major field of public affairs? The US Chamber of Commerce and the NAM are far more liberal than the AFL-CIO on trade with Russia. Groups of businessmen, with the consent of the Administration, have explored the possibility of expanding trade. Leaders of practically every Western country hope that increased trade

and cultural relations will reduce cold war tensions. At the Chamber's annual convention, just held here, it took an enlightened position on several points. It condemned the vicious "Connally Reservation" which the 79th Congress passed as America's escape clause from the World Court. It damages our prestige all over the world. The Chamber also urged the government to explore steps "to more effectively open channels of communication with the people of mainland China." Very good in spite of a split infinitive.

But compare this with the dogmatic, doctrinaire AFL-CIO. Last January President George Meany attacked businessmen who called for trade expansion with "the Communist regimes." In March the Executive Council denounced as a "myth" the widespread notion that trade expansion with Moscow would help rationalize relations, or might split off satellites.

The American labor movement is a disappointment to a lot of us. Its membership seems stuck on dead center. So far from being radical it is to the right of the Chamber of Commerce in international affairs. President George Meany, 70, follows the anti-Red line of Jay Lovestone, director of the International Affairs Department. He has only just been persuaded not to take American labor out of the International Labor Organization (ILO). Visiting Americans are always astonished to find the respectability of the British pub second only to the Established Church; visiting Englishmen are stunned to find the American labor movement well to the right of management on world affairs.

★ Notes: Negroes have most to lose if the Dirksen constitutional amendment to undercut the "one-man, one-vote" reapportionment decision passes; outside of the South most Negroes live in the disenfranchised cities. . . . How state malapportionment works: On March 2 the Missouri House, 68-83, killed a \$1 minimum wage bill; the 68 votes represented 2.7 million people, the 83 votes only 1.3 million. . . . The mail of Congressmen is running against the US Vietnam war. . . . You'll be glad to know the US has \$13 billion invested in defense stockpiles; this includes 7,418,509 pounds of feathers.

CONTENTS

THE WEEK - Wave of the Past,
Researching Social Needs, Challenge to
Nasser, Business Administration, Pulitzer
Prizes, Eclipse of "The Sun" 1

Paris-Moscow Flirtation

- Michel Gordey 10

Birth of a Bill - Andrew Kopkind 11

Speeding Up School Integration

- Alexander M. Bickel 14

Poor Chicago - James Ridgeway 17

BOOKS - Reviews by Irving Howe,
Nathaniel McKitterick, Patrick O'Donovan,
George Eagle, Lawrence Grauman 21

FEIFFER 29

ART by Frank Getlein 30

FILMS by Stanley Kauffmann 32

CORRESPONDENCE 35

THE STAFF

Editor-in-Chief - Gilbert A. Harrison

Managing Editor - Alex Campbell

Books and Arts Editor - Robert Evett

Associate Editors - James Ridgeway,

Andrew Kopkind

Assistant to the Editors - F. R. Ruskin

Copy Editor - Lucille Davis

Contributing Editors: Alexander M. Bickel,
Robert Brustein, Asher Brynes,
Helen Fuller, Frank Getlein, B. H. Haggin,
Morton H. Halperin, Irving Howe,
Christopher Jencks, Gerald W. Johnson,
Stanley Kauffmann, Murray Kempton,
Charles Burton Marshall, Helen Hill Miller

Publisher - Robert B. Luce

Circulation Manager - Bertha Lehman

Business Manager - Glenon Matthiesen

New York Advertising Representative -

Roland Gomez, Murray Hill Advertising
Inc., 64 East 34th St., New York, N.Y. 10016

Wave of the Past

smile the next time he is required to rise in the United Nations and extol the rule of law. The US not only did not consult the OAS, but seems deliberately to have tried to conceal what its real motives were by insisting up to the last minute that protection of US citizens was the sole reason for having sent in troops. "There was certainly nothing like that," said Presidential Press Secretary Reedy the morning after, when asked if the aim was to prevent a Communist take-over.

Comparisons are invidious, yet it has to be recalled that John F. Kennedy in 1962 at the time of the Cuba missiles crisis acted only after irrefutable evidence was at hand of Soviet placement of intermediate ballistic missiles in Cuba. Even then, and despite the urgent need for speed, Mr. Kennedy consulted with the OAS every step of the way. Moreover, he knew his own mind and his advisers knew he knew it, so they could and did push a variety of ideas at him hard. Who is pushing today, and what? When so-called "hawks" present their views to Mr. Johnson, they seem to be pushing at an open door, which, however, is barred to less simple-minded suggestions.

And that is not the worst. Increasingly, the Administration betrays not just irritation or impatience, but a sort of cold and powerful anger when alternative suggestions are made - either by friends abroad or at home. In recent days, Mr. Johnson or his advisers have managed to offend Japan (the Japanese press was accused of being "infiltrated" by Communists), the President of Pakistan and the Prime Minister of India, who were disinvited to Washington for not seeing eye to eye with the Administration about China and Vietnam, and the Prime Ministers of Canada and Britain, who were allowed to come and see the President but blotted their copybooks by presuming to proffer advice that did not entirely coincide with US policy. Peevishness would be an all-too-human fault, but this is a perilous manner of dealing with differences. And the President does not reserve his petulance for foreigners. When before, one might ask, has it been suggested that Americans should follow their President dumbly down whatever dead end he chooses to lead them? There may be occasions when one can do other than trust and hope. But any suggestion that criticism of foreign policy is unpatriotic is unprecedented (even in time of war) and repugnant.

Fortunately, a number of citizens who are no less interested than the President in the cause of freedom are expressing and, one prays, will continue to express, their dissents. It is our own judgment, for example, that in the Far East, the US should long ago have taken steps to try and break down Communist China's isolation from the community of nations, that our government should have recog-

nized Communist China, and ought now to be prepared to include the Viet Cong in "unconditional discussions" about the future of South Vietnam, two-thirds of which they control. In Latin America, our present policies are equally in need of basic revision.

The United States must stop appearing partial to reactionary regimes whose professed anti-Communism holds our government in bondage, and we must do this not only because freedom is our trademark, but because these regimes are the wave of the past and we do not wish to go down with them. Mr. Johnson wants to block the road to Communism, and so do we all. For that, one needs the active participation of the people of these countries which are vulnerable to Communist agitation. In Latin America, with whom in fact are we becoming allied in this fight against Communism? US Marines entered the Dominican Republic not to save that nation's first democratically elected government in 30 years. On the contrary the overthrow of that democratic government of Juan Bosch by a military *junta* raised no loud alarms in Washington. Indeed, following the overthrow of the Bosch government in 1963, the US made more money available to the Dominican Republic than it had ever done before. Now, however, the Marines land to prevent a populace devoted to the party of Bosch from restoring constitutional government. Mr. Johnson last week said that the people of the Dominican Republic "must be permitted to freely choose the path of political democracy, social justice and economic progress." That being our intent, why not, while US troops are still there, hold a referendum posing a single question to the people: Do you want the constitutional government restored?

It took the Administration over a week to patch together and make public (but not officially) every shred of evidence with which to back up its claim that Communists had "infiltrated" the Dominican revolt and were rapidly rising to the top. Of course there are a handful of Communists in the Dominican Republic. Who ever doubted it? But 55 Communists, with sharp differences among themselves, neither made nor controlled the revolt, nor have they been the allies of Juan Bosch. The present leader of the constitutional forces (read rebel) is not, by the admission of Mr. Johnson's envoy to the Dominican Republic, John Bartlow Martin, a Communist – though it would not be too surprising if he became one. For the real effort of our military exercise will not be the isolation or denigration of "extremist elements"; it will be the radicalization of Latin America, with democratic forces driven into the arms of Communists – in despair, having bitterly concluded that the only choice is between US-supported militarists and Castro-type revolutions. There may only have been 55 known Communists active in the Dominican revolt last week, but one can be sure the

number of Communist sympathizers will multiply in proportion to the duration of the US occupation.

The Administration now emphasizes close cooperation with the OAS. But who in the OAS will it trust to be anti-Communist enough? Yes, the invasion of the Dominican Republic has been cheered by Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, Paraguay, Bolivia – all governed by the military. But Mexico, Uruguay, Ecuador, Chile, Peru, Costa Rica and even Venezuela, a country that has reason to fear a Castro-type insurrection, have been badly shaken by what has happened. The Costa Rica delegate to the OAS spoke for many when he rebuked "the mental laxity that confuses social reform with Communism."

Political upheavals of one sort or another are the order of the day, and we face a series of disasters unless the US recognizes that it has neither the right nor the power, finally, to "vet" the political systems of other nations. This government, Mr. Johnson says, intends "to carry on the struggle against tyranny no matter in what ideology it cloaks itself." Are we to conclude from what happened in the Dominican Republic that the Johnson Administration means to send the Marines to suppress any revolt that just might eventually come under the control of some kind of Marxists? That is a prescription for global anti-Americanism. The Russians have learned, and the Chinese will learn later, that there are sharp limits to the control a great power can exercise, even over its neighbors. Immunity to Communism may be built up by striving for social justice, and to tyranny by genuine dedication to political democracy. Nevertheless, there are going to be reactionary regimes and regimes containing Communists – including some in Latin America – whatever the US does or does not do. Where the cause of democracy is temporarily lost, either through ineptitude or for any other reason, the US and the rest of the non-Communist world have to live with that disagreeable fact, while patiently working to change it. This implies no support for the "domino theory." There is no suggestion here that many countries are suckers for Communism, so that if one falls others will follow. On the contrary, among the new or developing countries, exceptions to a vigorous rejection of Communism have been remarkably few. We conclude from this that the non-Communist world can well afford to pursue the brightening possibilities of a détente with Russia and an end to the Cold War. The Administration, however, is becoming almost neurotically irritable when allies or friends dare to say so. Nothing could delight the Communists more than this spectacle of the mighty, armed-to-the-teeth US defacing its own image, out of an exaggerated fear of their power to subvert the world. This is not a foreign policy, it is a gut reaction, and the time has come to end it.